

Claim 6 is clearly directed to a semiconductor device (as are claims 1-5) and not to a method of manufacture, and does not provide a link between the Invention I device and the Invention II method. The Examiner did not provide any reasons as to why the Examiner asserted that claim 6 is a linking claim, and claim 6 does not fall within the definition of the most common types of linking claims set forth in MPEP 809.03 (August 2001).

Therefore, in view of the above, it is respectfully requested that claim 6 be grouped together and examined with the claims of Invention I, as search and examination of claims 1-6 would not impose a serious burden on the Examiner per MPEP 803.

Examination of the present application in view of the above election is respectfully requested.

Please charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,



David G. Posz  
Reg. No. 37,701

Posz & Bethards, PLC  
11250 Roger Bacon Drive, Suite 10  
Reston, VA 20190  
(703)707-9110 (phone)  
Customer No. 23400